

Date: Monday, September 6, 2011
Time: N/A
Place: N/A

PRESENT:

1460 BUTE STREET - DE414843 - ZONE RM-5A (COMPLETE APPLICATION)

Minutes
Motion

Board

V. Potter Director of Development Services (Chair)
B. Toderian Director of Planning
D. McLellan General Manager of Community Services Group
J. Dobrovolny Director of Transportation

Advisory Panel

S. Romses Representative of the Design Professions (Urban Design Panel)
F. Rafii Representative of the Design Professions
J. Stovell Representative of the Development Industry
K. Maust Representative of the Design Professions
S. Bozorgzadeh Representative of the General Public
J. Miletic-Prelovac Representative of the General Public
P. Sanderson Representative of the General Public

Regrets

M. Biazi Representative of the General Public
C. Chung Representative of the General Public
M. Pez Representative of the Development Industry

ALSO PRESENT:

City Staff:

S. Esworthy Manager, Enquiry Centre, Development Services
R. The Engineering Services - Projects Branch
S. Black Development Planner
S. Barker Project Facilitator

BUTE STREET - DE414843 - ZONE RM-5A

G. Borowski Merrick Architecture
J. Eslamboli Beach & Bute Development Ltd.

Recording Secretary: L. Harvey

CLERK TO THE BOARD: L. Harvey

- BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES**
None.
-

**3. 133 EAST 8TH AVENUE - DE414511 - ZONE C-3A
(COMPLETE APPLICATION)**

Applicant: Merrick Architecture

Request: To develop this site with a four-storey multiple dwelling building containing four (4) dwelling units and one level of underground parking having access from Beach Avenue. This application seeks additional density (10%) by way of a transfer of heritage density from a donor site at 163 West Hastings Street.

Development Planner's Opening Comments

Sailen Black, Development Planner, introduced the application and described the context for the site. The application is for a 4-storey building with four dwelling units with underground parking. The application also includes a transfer of heritage density in the amount of 10%. Mr. Black noted that the increase in density will have no impact on the neighbours. The zoning allows for a variety of residential buildings and compatible uses. Guideline goals include compatibility with neighbouring development, streetscape character, open spaces, view retention, sunlight access and privacy. Mr. Black stated that the application in its design and architecture generally meets the expectation of the guidelines that are relevant for the area. He added that there are some minor design development recommendations within the standard conditions in the Staff Committee Report. Mr. Black stated that there had been relatively few responses from the nearby neighbours. Residents of the adjacent building at the 5th floor were concerned that the penthouse structure and associated mechanical would block their view from their living room space. He noted that staff recommended reducing the building or elevator structure somewhat, to respond to the concern.

Mr. Black reviewed the recommendations contained in the Staff Committee Report dated September 6, 2011. The recommendation was for support of the proposal, subject to the conditions contained in the Staff Committee Report.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarifications were provided by Mr. Black:

- The parkade podium will have landscaping on it but will not have any structures.
- The steps in elevation on the site will be separated with retaining walls
- The applicants have several options to reduce the effect on private views
- An outright 60 foot tall building could be built on the site, higher than what is proposed
- The angle height envelope is intended to preserve sunlight access
- There is no significant impact on public lands as a result of shadowing from the building
- One unit could be developed with a presence onto the street.

Applicant's Comments

Mr. Borowski said he was delighted to bring forth the application as he thought they had produced a high quality building that will enhance the west end neighbourhood and fit in a neighbourly way. He added that they have met with the five neighbours in the building behind that will be affected. They have tried to address their concerns and build a high quality project

as it is in a significant location. Mr. Borowski said they didn't have any issues with the conditions in the Staff Committee Report. He added that they have been in the neighbour's suite where there were some concerns regarding loss of view and he thinks they will be able to make some adjustments without compromising the quality of the building. He also thought there weren't any issues with lowering the elevator overrun.

Questions/Discussion

In response to questions raised by the Board and Panel, the following clarification was provided by the applicant team:

- The applicant is altering the design of the enclosed balconies to conform better to the bylaw.
- The ground floor suite will have an entrance at grade with the other units opening into the elevator lobby.
- The building height will be reduced either by combining the upper two suites to allow the elevator shaft to be lowered or by reducing ceiling heights from 10 foot to 9 foot 6 inches. Taking six inches off each floor would still allow for a high quality building.
- Currently the driveway ramp is at 12.5% grade. Condition A.2.3 in the Staff Committee Reports indicated that a maximum of 10% is allowed. The applicant thought they could comply with the condition.
- Stepped retaining walls are planned on the north and east side of the site to help make for a seamless transition to the adjoining sites. Plantings will be provided along the edge.
- Access to the roof is not proposed due to the proximity of the neighbours to the north, as access might further affect views.

Mr. Toderian said he wanted to clarify with staff regarding the roof top access. He thought the applicant could do more with the design. He wanted to confirm that it wasn't the Planning Department who did not want rooftop access, but rather it was the applicant seeking to be neighbourly. Mr. Borowski added that the neighbours were aware that they had a right to build outright to 60 feet.

Comments from other Speakers

None.

Panel Opinion

Mr. Romses mentioned that the project was fully supported by the Urban Design Panel. They recognized that it was a small and challenging site. The building was even more challenged by having to provide the underground parking. Mr. Romses said the Panel thought the applicant had done a fine job in being neighbourly and was providing high quality materials for the design. The Panel also advised the applicant to keep the architectural expression simple.

Mr. Rafii thought it was a very well put together project. He commented that the relaxation of the corner cuts were much better for the neighbours. Mr. Rafii recommended Condition 1.1 be a consideration item.

Mr. Stovell said he was in support of the application but felt more could be done on the site and wondered if it would be a lost opportunity not to have a larger building. Mr. Stovell agreed that Condition 1.1 could be a consideration item.

Ms. Maust said she was pleased to recommend support for a well resolved project that included heritage density. She also agreed that Condition 1.1 should be a consideration item.

Ms. Miletic-Prelovac said she was in support of the application but thought it could be a bigger building. However, she added that she did like the scale of the building.

Mr. Sanderson was in support of the application and thought it was a nice approach for an infill site. He thought the building had been well designed and responded well to the neighbourhood and the adjacent neighbours.

Ms. Bozorgzadeh said she was in support of the application and thought it was a beautiful choice for the site.

Board Discussion

Mr. Toderian thanked the applicant for a well designed building. He thought the site could have accommodated a little more and would still have been supportable. Mr. Toderian acknowledged that the applicant had been very accommodating to the few neighbours who were concerned about private views. He added that he didn't want to set a precedent whereby the City required a lower building than could be achieved in an outright development simply to accommodate a private view issue. This is really a private decision of the developer. Mr. Toderian also expressed a desire to explore the feasibility of rooftop access. Mr. Toderian volunteered to be part of any future discussion with the neighbours.

Mr. McLellan commended the applicant for the design. He said he will miss the old house on the corner but age had taken its toll. He said he agreed with the recommendation and liked the idea of having roof top access.

Mr. Dobrovolny noted the irony of the discussion regarding the applicant being criticized for not wanting a larger building on the site when so many other applicants want to push the envelope. Mr. Dobrovolny supported the amendments put forth by Mr. Toderian. He added that he would like to see some roof top access and that it was a nice looking project.

Motion

It was moved by Mr. Toderian and seconded by Mr. McLellan and was the decision of the Board:

THAT the Board APPROVE Development Application No. DE414843 in accordance with the Staff Committee Report dated September 6, 2010, with the following amendments:

1.1 *consideration regarding the reduction of* view impact of the proposed elevator structure on the nearest residential neighbour;

Note to Applicant: This can be accomplished by lowering the elevator penthouse, by lowering the building as a whole, or some combination thereof. The structure should be lowered to be three feet or less in height relative to the living room level of the nearby unit. *Staff note that the outright*

development potential on the site would have more of an impact than the proposed building.

1.2 consideration be given to providing well designed and neighbourly resident access to the roof.

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McLellan congratulated Ms. Potter for doing a great job on her debut.

5. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 3:50 PM